



LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

Ultrafast kinetics subsequent to shock in an unreacted, oxygen balanced mixture of nitromethane and hydrogen peroxide

M. R. Armstrong, J. M. Zaug, C. D. Grant, J. C. Crowhurst, S. Bastea

June 30, 2014

Ultrafast kinetics subsequent to shock in an unreacted, oxygen balanced mixture of nitromethane and hydrogen peroxide
San Francisco, CA, United States
July 13, 2014 through July 18, 2014

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Ultrafast kinetics subsequent to shock in an unreacted, oxygen balanced mixture of nitromethane and hydrogen peroxide

Michael R. Armstrong, Joseph M. Zaug, Christian D. Grant, Jonathan C. Crowhurst and Sorin Bastea

Chemical Sciences Division, Physical and Life Sciences
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550

Abstract. We apply ultrafast optical interferometry to measure the Hugoniot of an oxygen-balanced mixture of nitromethane and hydrogen peroxide (NM/HP) and compare with Hugoniot data for pure nitromethane (NM) and a 90% hydrogen peroxide/water mixture (HP), as well as theoretical predictions. Unlike the Hugoniots of both HP and NM, in the NM/HP mixture we observe shock speed deviations to values lower than the unreacted Hugoniot. Although the trend should reverse for high enough piston speeds, the initial behavior is unexpected. Possible explanations range from mixing effects to a complex index of refraction in the reacted solution. If this is indeed a signature of chemical initiation it would suggest that the process may not be kinetically limited (on a ~ 100 ps time scale) between the initiation threshold and the von Neumann pressure.

Introduction

The propagation of shockwaves in energetic liquids is accompanied by complex physical and chemical phenomena that remain of much interest both experimentally and theoretically¹⁻³ due to their fundamental and practical relevance. The transition from the shocked but unreacted state to one that has undergone exothermic chemistry is for example yet to be fully understood although it determines important characteristics such as the failure diameter and shock front curvature in detonations^{4,5}. Understanding the dynamic response of a shocked liquid prior to chemical bond breaking is a major component of modeling efforts aimed to better predict reactivity under high pressure and temperature conditions. Nitromethane is a prototypical energetic material and as a result its high pressure behavior has been often characterized using shock experiments^{6,7}; more

recently, molecular dynamics (MD) simulations have also been reported^{8,9}. A comprehensive understanding of the shock physics and chemistry of most other energetic liquids, and particularly liquid mixtures, is however far less developed. Recently, the shock Hugoniots of nonideal and ideal fluid mixtures were experimentally measured and it was suggested that hydrogen bonding networks affect nonideal mixture response: nonideal mixture shock velocities shifted away from so-called universal liquid Hugoniot predictions¹⁰. Since most equation of state developments^{6,7} and simulations^{8,9} rely heavily on high pressure experimental data it is important to understand how other fluids behave under similar shock conditions and to what extent such deviations are indicators of “non-universal” behavior.

Here we report new ultrafast shockwave measurements on an oxygen balanced mixture of nitromethane and hydrogen peroxide (NM/HP), and compare the results with unreacted shock Hugoniot data for a 90% hydrogen peroxide/water (HP) mixture¹, two representative energetic liquids^{4,11} with zero and positive oxygen balance, respectively. We compare the NM/HP data with the empirical liquid Hugoniot proposed by Woolfolk et al.¹², equation of state predictions based on intermolecular interactions¹³, and unreacted nitromethane (NM) Hugoniot data from gas gun measurements and our own ultrafast measurements. We present an alternative empirical form that yields the correct behavior both at $u_p/c_0 = 0$ and asymptotically as $u_p/c_0 \rightarrow \infty$. For the NM/HP mixture we observe a likely reduction in volume above a piston velocity threshold of 1.7 km s^{-1} , and discuss possible explanations of this effect.

Experimental details

The NM/HP sample was a mixture of 90% hydrogen peroxide (in water) and nitromethane with 48.2 (HP)/51.8 (NM) weight fractions. NM and HP are miscible at this concentration.¹⁴ The experimental apparatus is the same as used in previous work^{1,15,16}, shown schematically in Figs. 1 and 2. A chirped $\sim 350 \text{ ps}$ duration, $\sim 25 \text{ nm}$ full width at half maximum (FWHM) spectral width, 800 nm wavelength pump pulse is focused by a 2 cm focal length lens to $\sim 25 \text{ micron}$ FWHM intensity, and drives a shock wave through a $\sim 1 \text{ micron}$ thick Al ablator on a glass cover slip into the sample, which is liquid in all cases.

Meanwhile, a pair of chirped probe pulses incident from the opposite side measure a time-dependent phase shift (effectively an ultrafast analog to the Velocity Interferometry System for Any Reflector (VISAR)¹⁷ system used in longer time scale experiments) which, via methods described previously^{1,15}, give the shock speed, the piston speed (ie. the speed of Al/sample interface), and the index of refraction between the shock front and the piston interface. On the probe side, the piston interface is imaged onto the slit of an imaging spectrometer with a 0.28 NA microscope objective, with $10\times$ total magnification between the sample and the detector, and the ultimate spatial resolution is $\sim 2 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$. From knowledge of the particle speed just behind the shock front and the shockwave speed, the pressure and density of the shockwave compressed state can be derived from the Rankine-Hugoniot equations, which connect the initial and final thermodynamic states of the material using conservation of mass and momentum. We note that our experiment measures the piston speed, not the particle speed just behind shock front, but it has been shown in previous work¹ that, assuming the particle speed is the same as the measured piston speed, the measured shockwave speed will correspond to the known Hugoniot to better than 2% accuracy.^{1,16} Here, we measure the Hugoniot of a previously uncharacterized sample (HP/NM), and assume an accuracy of better than 2% in the measurement for the unreacted species. Generally, as discussed below, the standard deviation of our data is less than 2%.




Figure 1: The experimental layout for shock loading the NM/HP mixture. A 350 ps duration pump pulse drives the shock wave. Meanwhile, two identical but 10 ps time delayed probe pulses incident from the opposite side obtain velocimetry data from the shock breakout region. PBS stands for polarizing beam splitter and $\lambda/4$ is a quarter waveplate set to rotate the polarization 90 degrees in double pass.




Figure 2: A close-up of a cross-section of the shock breakout profile. Data were obtained from the both the center of the breakout profile and off-center.

For quantitative comparisons between our data and Hugoniot from theory or fits to previous data, we evaluate a mean pairwise difference (MPD) given by:

$$\text{MPD} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |u_s - u_p| \quad (1)$$

where H , a continuous function, is a theoretical Hugoniot or a fit to previous data, u_s is the measured shockwave speed, u_p is the corresponding measured piston speed, and the average is taken over measured data points. Mean pairwise differences larger than the standard deviation of the data are statistically significant.

This technique obtains a full spatial profile^{15,16} of the shock breakout (see Fig. 2) where the aspect ratio of the experiment is sufficient to assume near 1D compression over the central portion of the profile^{16,18}. Since the piston speed varies with spatial position, it is possible (analogous to previous work with UDE¹⁹) to obtain several points along the Hugoniot simultaneously with a single shot, rather than only one point per shot (typically at the center of the spatial profile) as in most previous work^{1,16,20}. Here (for NM/HP), we measure shock parameters at several points along the spatial profile from each of multiple shots at a

given pump energy, for three pump energies. This increases the amount of data which may be obtained per shot, and allows averaging of Hugoniot points which reduces noise and enables statistical characterization of the measurement. This also enables direct confirmation of the assumption of 1D compression, where shock parameters should only depend on the local intensity of the pump²¹ not (explicitly) the pump energy – when the 1D approximation is valid, the shock and piston speeds are correlated regardless of the total pump energy.

To calculate the universal liquid Hugoniot¹² (for a comparison to the measured Hugoniot data), the sound speed was measured in NM/HP under ambient conditions. The adiabatic speed of sound of the liquid mixture at ambient pressure and 294 K was measured using the impulsive stimulated light scattering (ISLS) technique²², where here, instead of containing the sample in a diamond anvil cell, a drop of the liquid sample was placed between two borosilicate microscope coverslips separated by a 120 μm thick teflon gasket.

Results and discussion

For the NM/HP mixture, we measured shock and piston speeds at three different pulse energies, 41, 50, and 80 μJ . For each pump energy, we obtained between forty and fifty shots. Shock and piston speed pairs were determined for approximately 10 positions near the spatial center of the pump pulse for all shots, and all shots of a given energy and position were averaged to obtain the u_s - u_p data shown in Fig. 3. Error bars are plus or minus one standard deviation of the data from the mean for data at a given pump energy and spatial position. For pure NM, we obtained center of profile Hugoniot data under conditions similar to HP data obtained previously.¹ The MPD between our NM data and a linear fit to previously measured unreacted NM shock Hugoniot data²³ for $u_p > 1.2$ km/s (ie. where the noise is low) is 0.6%, which is within the standard deviation of the previously measured NM data from its linear fit, 1.6%.

The inset to Fig. 3 shows NM/HP data for 50

μJ pump energy where points along a spatial 1D cut through the pump profile are labeled by the corresponding position in CCD pixels at the detector. The spacing of CCD pixels scales to $2\text{ }\mu\text{m}/\text{pixel}$ at the sample. Consistent with the spatial profile of the pump, the piston speed in the inset to Fig. 3 starts from a minimum on one side of the spatial profile (at pixel -5), reaches a maximum at the center of the pump profile (near pixel 0), and then decreases to another minimum on the other side of the profile (at pixel 5). A similar progression is observed in data at all pump energies.

To calculate the ULH, the sound speed in the NM/HP mixture was measured under ambient conditions using ISLS as described in the experimental section. Based on an average of three measurements, the sound speed was $1582.0\text{ km/s} \pm 1.6\text{ m/s}$. The acoustic frequency for the measurements was 0.94 GHz ; we did not attempt to measure acoustic dispersion as a function of frequency and so cannot be absolutely certain that we measured the fully relaxed sound speed. If a glass-like hydrogen bonding network persists in this mixture then it is conceivable that the sound speed would be approximately 4-8% lower than our measured value.²²

For points below 1.7 km/s piston speed, shock speeds are larger than the unreacted universal liquid Hugoniot¹² by a MPD of 2.1% assuming the measured sound speed (at ambient conditions) of 1.582 km/s , and also larger than a thermochemical calculation of the mixture Hugoniot by a MPD of 5.1%. The later estimate is based on thermodynamic modeling¹³ of the individual mixture components using isotropic exponential-6 potentials augmented by dipole-dipole interactions, calibrated to available experimental data^{1,6,7,13,24}; the difference with the experiments may possibly be due to limitations of such modeling for relatively low temperature mixtures, particularly due to the use of isotropic short range interactions and standard unlike-pair mixing rules for a fairly large molecule such as nitromethane.




Figure 3: Hugoniot data for the NM/HP mixture, the universal liquid Hugoniot, and the Hugoniot calculated using thermochemical techniques. The vertical dashed line is at 1.7 km/s piston speed, which is near the initiation threshold for HP and NM (see main text). The inset shows the data taken with $50\text{ }\mu\text{J}$ pump energy (without error bars). Each point is labeled by CCD pixel row, where each pixel row corresponds to a spatial position on the sample along a 1D cut through the pump profile. Pixel 0 is the center of the profile. A fit to data below 1.7 km/s piston speed is shown as a guide.

Except for one point (at approximately 1.6 km/s piston speed and 4.5 km/s shock speed), all data below 1.7 km/s piston speed are consistent with a single linear trend and, generally, the average piston speed increases with pump energy. The remaining data vary substantially with pump energy. Since 1.7 km/s is near the initiation thresholds of both NM (1.84 km/s ²³) and HP (1.7 km/s ²⁵), henceforth we will refer to data below this value as the unreacted Hugoniot of the NM/HP mixture. Further, above 1.7 km/s piston speed the data deviate significantly below the extrapolated unreacted Hugoniot, likely due to effects related to initiation, although the downward trend is puzzling given the expected exothermic reactivity. Such trends have been previously associated with first-order phase transformations in shocked solids²⁶ and continuous shock-induced dissociation in

fluids, e.g. molecular nitrogen²⁷; discontinuous dissociation, i.e. liquid-liquid phase transition, has also been suggested for molecular hydrogen²⁸ and likely occurs in shocked carbonyl disulfide (CS₂)²⁹. Nominally exothermic reactions within a ~300 ps time window have been observed in pure nitromethane above about 2 km/s piston speed.³⁰ We should note however that the interpretation of our data rests on the assumption that the index of refraction behind the shock front is real, yet recent simulations³¹ of shocked, reacting NM indicate that the reacting sample may develop an imaginary index of refraction.

We also note that the observed deviation threshold varies with the laser drive energy and speculate that this variation is due to deviations from quasi-1D compression. Although the data explicitly confirm quasi-1D behavior for compression along the unreacted Hugoniot, the response of the sample may be sufficiently nonlinear (above a threshold piston speed) for the hydrodynamic response to deviate from quasi-1D, resulting in a variation of threshold hydrodynamic behavior with compressed volume (which is proportional to the pulse energy). Related to this, we note that deviations from the unreacted Hugoniot are least severe for the highest pump energy, where we would expect the least deviation from quasi-1D conditions.

This deviation occurs within the 350 ps time window of the experiment, in contrast to previous ultrafast HP data, which do not diverge from the corresponding unreacted Hugoniot for any piston speed between the initiation threshold (of 1.7 km/s piston speed)²⁵ and the von Neumann pressure for the steady detonation¹. This suggests that the initiation mechanism in NM/HP may differ from that in HP, with the oxygen-balanced mixture possibly exhibiting faster initial kinetics.

Ultrafast NM/HP data, NM data compiled from gas gun experiments²³, ultrafast NM data, and ultrafast HP data from previous work¹ are shown in Fig. 4. The ultrafast HP data were calculated by sorting previously published data¹ by piston speed, and taking an average of every subsequent 5 points in this sorted set. The original HP data set had 100 points distributed between 1

km/s and 2.5 km/s piston speed. The averaged dataset has 20 points total, with the averaged points well-centered in the larger set of unaveraged points. This procedure reduces the scatter per point and makes trends in the data easier to see. The ultrafast NM data were derived from the same averaging procedure applied to center of profile data acquired in the same way as the HP data of ref. 1. Nine averaged points were derived from the original ultrafast NM dataset comprising 45 shots.

Fig. 4c shows the data plotted in the normalized form of Woolfolk et al.¹². The plot is consistent with the existence of a “universal” liquid Hugoniot (ULH) as proposed by Woolfolk et al., which posits that all liquid Hugoniot data should fall on the same curve when plotted as u_s/c_0 vs. u_p/c_0 , where c_0 is the speed of sound in the sample under ambient conditions. They suggested the functional form,

$$\frac{u_s}{c_0} = 1 + a_0 \left(1 - e^{-a_1 \frac{u_p}{c_0}} \right) + a_2 \frac{u_p}{c_0}, \quad (2)$$

for this “universal” curve, which has the correct limiting behavior at low piston speeds, and trends to a linear dependence at high piston speeds, as usually assumed and often experimentally observed in shock physics; the Woolfolk et al. parameters for the form of eq. 1 are $a_0 = 0.37$, $a_1 = 2$, and $a_2 = 1.62$. Although this relation is the most commonly cited, at least one other form for the high piston speed liquid Hugoniot was proposed by Voskoboinikov et al.³², without the exponential term. The Woolfolk et al. ULH matches well the HP and NM/HP data at higher piston speeds ($u_p/c_0 > 1$), with significant deviations occurring for lower values. Our fit to the data of Fig. 3c using the form of Eq.1 gives $a_0 = 0.67$, $a_1 = 2.43$, and $a_2 = 1.33$; such fits are sometimes used when the Woolfolk functional form, not the actual parameters, is assumed to be “universal.” It is worth noting that there is no fundamental basis for the above functional form (or the ULH idea). For example, we find that the relation,

$$\frac{u_s}{c_0} = 1 + \frac{u_p/c_0}{\frac{u_p}{c_0} + b_0} - 2e^{-b_1 \frac{c_0}{u_p}} + \frac{4}{3} \frac{u_p}{c_0}, \quad (3)$$




Figure 4: a) Unreacted Hugoniot data for the NM/HP mixture, NM Hugoniot data from previous gas gun experiments, averaged ultrafast NM data, and averaged ultrafast HP Hugoniot data from previous work. The vertical dashed line is at 1.7 km/s piston speed, which is near the initiation threshold for HP and NM. b) Thermodynamic states corresponding to shock data, with initial volumes of 0.79 cm^3 for NM/HP, 0.88 cm^3 for NM, and 0.71 cm^3 for HP. Thermochemical calculations give a temperature for the NM/HP mixture of 920K at a piston speed of 1.7 km/s. c) The same data as Fig. 4a, but in the normalized form of Woolfolk et al.¹², where the shock and piston speeds are normalized by the ambient condition sound speed (for a given sample). The three fits are the Woolfolk form of the ULH¹² (eq. 1) with our fit for the parameters (red), the Woolfolk ULH using his parameters (green), and our form (from the text, blue). The blue and red curves very nearly overlap.

(shown in Fig. 4c as a blue line), which actually yields the right asymptotic behavior for $u_p/c_0 \rightarrow \infty$ (ideal gas limit), works equally well with $b_0 = 0.591$ and $b_1 = 4.68$; of course the exponential term can be easily neglected for the piston velocities of interest here.

Although unreacted data for all pump energies are consistent with a single Hugoniot for the NM/HP oxygen-balanced mixture, deviations of the data from the unreacted Hugoniot above the 1.7 km/s piston speed 1) depend significantly on the pump energy, and 2) are substantially more scattered than unreacted data. No obvious mechanism explains this, but threshold reactivity effects may play a role above 1.7 km/s piston speed. Future experimental development may enable extending the data to higher piston speeds and longer time scales, and thus help to elucidate these issues.

In conclusion, we have used ultrafast optical interferometry to measure the Hugoniot of an oxygen balanced nitromethane/hydrogen peroxide mixture, and compared these data with Hugoniot

data for pure nitromethane (NM) and a 90% hydrogen peroxide/water mixture (HP), as well as theoretical predictions. We observe a 2.1% percent mean pairwise difference between the measured shockwave speed (at the measured piston speed) in unreacted NM/HP and the corresponding “universal” liquid Hugoniot, which is larger than the average standard deviation of our data, 1.4%. For NM/HP, we observe deviations from the unreacted Hugoniot which may be related to mixing effects. We also generally note that the low particle speed form of the universal liquid Hugoniot is not strongly constrained by empirical data – an alternate form which gives the correct behavior in the high particle speed limit fits the data as well as the conventional Woolfolk form. We emphasize that an empirical form such as the ULH (based on the Woolfolk parameterization or otherwise) cannot replace the direct measurement of Hugoniot data.

We acknowledge useful conversations with L. E. Fried, C. Tarver, D. Dlott, and R. Manaa. This research was performed under the auspices of the

U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC52-07NA27344, and it was funded by Laboratory Directed Research and Development grant 11ERD067 with S.B. as principal investigator.

References

- (1) Armstrong, M. R.; Zaug, J. M.; Goldman, N.; Kuo, I.-F. W.; Crowhurst, J. C.; Howard, W. M.; Carter, J. A.; Kashgarian, M.; Chesser, J. M.; Barbee Jr., T. W.; et al. Ultrafast Shock Initiation of Exothermic Chemistry in Hydrogen Peroxide. *J Phys Chem A* **2013**, *117*, 13051–13058.
- (2) Maillet, J. B.; Bourasseau, E.; Desbiens, N.; Vallverdu, G.; Stoltz, G. Mesoscopic Simulations of Shock-to-Detonation Transition in Reactive Liquid High Explosive. *Epl* **2011**, *96*.
- (3) Kuo, I.-F. W.; Bastea, S.; Fried, L. E. Reactive Flow Modeling of Liquid Explosives via ALE3D/Cheetah Simulations. In: 2010; pp. 333–337.
- (4) Tarver, C.; Shaw, R.; Cowperthwaite, M. Detonation Failure Diameter Studies of 4 Liquid Nitroalkanes. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1976**, *64*, 2665–2673.
- (5) Bdzil, J.; Engelke, R.; Christenson, D. Kinetics Study of a Condensed Detonating Explosive. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1981**, *74*, 5694–5699.
- (6) Lysne, P.; Hardesty, D. Fundamental Equation of State of Liquid Nitromethane to 100 Kbar. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1973**, *59*, 6512–6523.
- (7) Winey, J. M.; Duvall, G. E.; Knudson, M. D.; Gupta, Y. M. Equation of State and Temperature Measurements for Shocked Nitromethane. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *113*, 7492–7501.
- (8) Sorescu, D. C.; Rice, B. M.; Thompson, D. L. Molecular Dynamics Simulations of Liquid Nitromethane. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2001**, *105*, 9336–9346.
- (9) Hervouet, A.; Desbiens, N.; Bourasseau, E.; Maillet, J.-B. Microscopic Approaches to Liquid Nitromethane Detonation Properties. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2008**, *112*, 5070–5078.
- (10) Schulze, P. A.; Dang, N. C.; Bolme, C. A.; Brown, K. E.; McGrane, S. D.; Moore, D. S. Shock Hugoniot Equations of State for Binary Ideal (Toluene/Fluorobenzene) and Nonideal (Ethanol/Water) Liquid Mixtures. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2013**, *117*, 6158–6163.
- (11) Engelke, R.; Sheffield, S. A.; Davis, L. L. Experimental and Predicted Detonation Parameters for Liquid-Phase H₂O₂/H₂O Mixtures. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2000**, *104*, 6894–6898.
- (12) Woolfolk, R. W.; Cowperthwaite, M.; Shaw, R. A "Universal" Hugoniot for Liquids. *Thermochimica Acta* **1973**, *5*, 409.
- (13) Bastea, S.; Fried, L. E. Exp6-Polar Thermodynamics of Dense Supercritical Water. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *128*, 174502.
- (14) DePiero, S. C. *Personal Communication*; 2013.
- (15) Armstrong, M. R.; Crowhurst, J. C.; Bastea, S.; Zaug, J. M. Ultrafast Observation of Shocked States in a Precompressed Material. *J. Appl. Phys.* **2010**, *108*, 023511.
- (16) Crowhurst, J. C.; Armstrong, M. R.; Knight, K. B.; Zaug, J. M.; Behymer, E. M. Invariance of the Dissipative Action at Ultrahigh Strain Rates Above the Strong Shock Threshold. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2011**, *107*, 144302.
- (17) Barker, L. M.; Hollenbach, R. E. Interferometer Technique for Measuring the Dynamic Mechanical Properties of Materials. *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **1965**, *36*, 1617–1620.
- (18) Armstrong, M. R.; Crowhurst, J. C.; Bastea, S.; Howard, W. M.; Zaug, J. M.; Goncharov, A. F. Prospects for Achieving High Dynamic Compression with Low Energy. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2012**, *101*, 101904.
- (19) Bolme, C. A.; McGrane, S. D.; Moore, D. S.; Whitley, V. H.; Funk, D. J. Single Shot Hugoniot of Cyclohexane Using a Spatially Resolved Laser Driven Shock Wave. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2008**, *93*.

- (20) Shulze, P. A.; Ivanov, T. W.; Bolme, C. A.; Brown, K. E.; Moore, D. S. Shock Hugoniot Equations of State for Binary Water-Alcohol-Mixtures. *J Appl Phys* **2014**, *115*, 023512.
- (21) Swift, D. C.; Kraus, R. G. Properties of Plastic Ablators in Laser-Driven Material Dynamics Experiments. *Phys. Rev. E* **2008**, *77*, 066402.
- (22) Zaug, J. M.; Slutsky, L. J.; Brown, J. M. Equilibrium Properties and Structural Relaxation in Methanol to 30.4 GPa. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, *98*, 6008–6016.
- (23) Craig, B. G. *Los Alamos Scientific Report No. GMX-8-MR-62-4*; 1962.
- (24) *LASL Shock Hugoniot Data*; Marsh, S. P., Ed.; Univ. California Press: Berkeley, CA, 1980.
- (25) Sheffield, S. A.; Dattlebaum, D. M.; Stahl, D. B.; Gibson, L. L.; Bartram, B. D.; Engelke, R. Shock Initiation and Detonation Study on High Concentration H₂O₂/H₂O Solutions Using In-Situ Magnetic Gauging. *Proc. 14th Int. Detonation Symp.* **2010**, 601–610.
- (26) Duvall, G. E.; Graham, R. A. Phase Transitions under Shock-Wave Loading. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **1977**, *49*, 523.
- (27) Nellis, W.; Holmes, N.; Mitchell, A.; Vanthiel, M. Phase-Transition in Fluid Nitrogen at High-Densities and Temperatures. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1984**, *53*, 1661–1664.
- (28) Scandolo, S. Liquid–liquid Phase Transition in Compressed Hydrogen from First-Principles Simulations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2003**, *100*, 3051–3053.
- (29) Sheffield, S. A. Response of Liquid Carbon Disulfide to Shock Compression. II. Experimental Design and Measured Hugoniot Information. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1984**, *81*, 3048–3063.
- (30) Brown, K. E.; McGrane, S. D.; Bolme, C. A.; Moore, D. S. Ultrafast Chemical Reactions in Shocked Nitromethane Probed with Dynamic Ellipsometry and Transient Absorption Spectroscopy. *J Phys Chem A* **2014**, *TBD*, TBD.
- (31) Pellouchoud, L. A.; Reed, E. J. Optical Characterization of Chemistry in Shocked Nitromethane with Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory. *J Phys Chem A* **2014**, *117*, 12288–12298.
- (32) Voskoboinikov, I. M.; Afanasenkov, A. N.; Bogomolov, V. M. Generalized Shock Adiabats for Organic Liquids. *Combust Explo Shock.* **1967**, *3*, 359–364.